EXHIBIT A

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE
3	
4	DEBORAH S. SKEANS, : CIVIL ACTION Executrix of the ESTATE OF :
_	FRANK E. PAVLIS, :
5	: Plaintiff, :
6	•
7	vs. :
,	KEY COMMERCIAL FINANCE, :
8	LLC, KEY COMMERCIAL FINANCE :
9	PROPERTIES, LLC, EQUITY : PROS,LLC, and MOBILE :
ý	AGENCY, LLC, :
10	:
11	Defendants. :
T T	JUSTIN BILLINGSLEY and KEY :
12	COMMERCIAL FINANCE, LLC, :
13	: Third-Party :
13	Plaintiffs, :
14	:
15	vs. :
10	DEBORAH S. SKEANS and :
16	DARBIN SKEANS, :
17	: Third-Party :
_ ,	Defendants : NO. 18-01516-CFC
18	
19	
20	Wilmington, Delaware Thursday April 15, 2021
21	10:00 o'clock, a.m.
	***Telephone conference
22	
23	
0.4	BEFORE: HONORABLE COLM F. CONNOLLY, U.S.D.C.J.
24	Valerie J. Gunning
25	Official Court Reporter
ļ	

1 PROCEEDINGS

(The following telephone conference was head beginning at 10:00 a.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Good morning. Counsel, let's have a roll call. Let's start with the plaintiff, please.

MS. POLESKY: Good morning, Your Honor. Joelle Polesky of Stradley Ronon, and my colleague, Bill Mahoney, with whom you're familiar, with also on the line.

MR. MAHONEY: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning. And then for the

defendant?

MR. KITTILA: Good morning, Your Honor. It's

Ted Kittila on behalf of defendants, and I'm joined on the

line by Bill Green from my office and client representative

Justin Billingsley.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Well, you all are aware I've denied the summary judgment, ready to move forward with trial, but we still have also this pending motion to supplement. What's the defendants' position on that now in light of my ruling?

MR. KITTILA: Your Honor, we believe that the motion to amend is too little too late. At this point in

time, Your Honor, I just think that it's a complete change in their strategy on how they've been prosecuting this case.

Just very quickly, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Well, that's all right. I mean, I just wanted to know your position.

MR. KITTILA: Yes.

THE COURT: You don't want to try the case and have them present in front of a jury completely inconsistent positions. You don't want to make an issue of that.

MR. KITTILA: Well stated, Your Honor. I suppose looking at it that way, if that's what they want to do, I think that they're entitled to do it.

We opposed it, Your Honor. We spent so much money on this case leading up to this point on this, so --

THE COURT: And I'm going to get to that. I'm going to get to that, but I needed -- in all seriousness, I often wonder, you know, sometimes defense attorneys, they want to get rid of what I see as low hanging fruit, which as a former trial lawyer I think would be great to have in front of a jury. I seriously do mean it.

Do you oppose this motion to supplement? If you don't oppose it, I will grant it, and then we'll be in front of a jury and they'll be struck with it.

MR. KITTILA: Your Honor, I have Mr. Billingsley on the phone and if he speaks up now and tells me that I'm

1 out on a limb, I would withdraw my motion for them to amend. 2 Justin, am I okay with that? 3 MR. BILLINGSLEY: Yes, Ted. I completely trust your judgment on this entirely. 4 5 MR. KITTILA: Okay. So we withdraw the motion, 6 the opposition. 7 THE COURT: Okay. So, in other words, you withdraw the opposition and I will just let it go forward 8 9 and then you can argue what you want in front of a jury. 10 MR. KITTILA: Yes, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Well, then, I'm going to 12 grant the motion and let them supplement. 13 All right. So then we need to set the case for 14 trial. How soon, the defendants, will you be ready to try the case? 15 MR. KITTILA: Your Honor, I'm going to trial 16 17 next week on another matter. We probably would be ready to 18 go as early as June. 19 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Plaintiff, then, 20 let's talk about a June trial date. I'm not sure I can fit one in actually. I can't do June. What about July? 21 Actually, I can't do July. I'm scheduled every week in July 22 23 for trial. I can put us down for August. 24 How long of a trial, from the defendants' point 25 of view, how long do you think the trial will be?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KITTILA: Your Honor, I think a maximum of three days would be what it would take. That's kind of my view on it, and August is wide open, Your Honor, for a trial. THE COURT: Okay. How about plaintiffs? many days do you think it will take? MR. MAHONEY: Yes. I think three days is wildly optimistic, Your Honor. I think it's a five-day trial, but any week in August is fine by us. THE COURT: All right. MS. POLESKY: Your Honor, I'm sorry. Joelle Polseky. I actually have conflicts Monday, March 9th and Friday, March 13th. THE COURT: Do you mean August? MS. POLESKY: Yes, I'm sorry. Sorry. looking at my calendar, so I'm assuming that everybody else can see what I'm staring at. I apologize. THE COURT: That's all right. All right. Let's do August 2nd. MR. KITTILA: That works, Your Honor, from defendants' standpoint. THE COURT: All right. Okay. Now, I want to I need a little bit of background here from say something. the plaintiff. As I understand it, there are two

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

essentially beneficiaries of this trust at the end of the day. Is that right? MR. KITTILA: Your Honor, effectively, there's one beneficiary. THE COURT: Who is the beneficiary? MR. KITTILA: It is the Watchtower organization. THE COURT: The Watchtower? MR. KITTILA: Yes. And forgive me. Mr. Billingsley probably knows better than I, but it is a religious organization based in New York. THE COURT: All right. How big is it? Do they have counsel? MR. KITTILA: Do they have their own counsel? They do. They have in-house counsel. THE COURT: And is that counsel fully apprised of what's going on in this case? MR. KITTILA: He is. THE COURT: And your understanding is that all of the proceeds of the trust that's at issue here are going to go to this Watchtower organization? MR. KITTILA: That is my understanding, Your Honor, yes. THE COURT: Here's what I'm concerned about. This case first came to my attention with the filing of a massive brief and supporting documents to support a

preliminary injunction that really had no basis under Third Circuit law. It was accompanied by a motion for expedited discovery that my recollection of the paperwork when I was looking at it, it was more than a foot. I mean, it was ridiculous how much paperwork was attached to it.

What I'm concerned about is that there's litigation -- essentially, this trust is like a carcass that allows it to be the subject of predatory behavior that nobody is checking what's going on here, that there's nothing really to stop the lawyering, whatever else is supporting this litigation effort. I am very troubled by that. I was very troubled by it when I heard argument about the original preliminary injunction, the motion to expedite, and I don't know what the jury is going to do in this case.

But that kind of concern, for instance, if there were a defense verdict I think would have to be addressed, and what bothers me the more I thought about it was just, you know, you've got an executrix which, you know, have got some personal ties to this, to the underlying dispute as far as I can tell, and as I say, I just don't really see the checking on the lawyering. And I'm not saying I've made definitive judgments, don't get me wrong, but I am really concerned and folks need to be mindful of that.

And I don't know. Maybe we should require somebody from the Watchtower organization to be present

1 during the trial and to be present during the pretrial 2 conference, because I want to make sure that they fully 3 appreciate where -- I mean, at the end of the day, you know, there's a lot of money being spent here. Especially if 4 5 there's no verdict for the plaintiffs, this trust took a 6 hit. 7 So I think maybe we ought to have the -- you know, and I think I have limited authority here because I 8 9 mean I recognize that Watchtower is not a party and at the 10 same time I just am troubled by, like, well who is checking 11 this? 12 So if you are telling me that Watchtower is 13 fully apprised of what's going on, I mean, are they involved 14 in discussions? 15 MR. MAHONEY: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Go ahead. 16 THE COURT: No. That's okay. 17 MR. MAHONEY: I was just on the phone with them 18 Tuesday. They have been fully apprised all along, Your 19 Honor. 20 THE COURT: And they know how much money has 21 been spent by the trust on legal fees to date? 22 MR. MAHONEY: They do. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I think maybe you ought 24 to have a representative of Watchtower present at the 25 pretrial conference. Let's set the date for that.

MS. POLESKY: Your Honor, while we're looking for dates, this is Joelle Polseky. I believe I saw a recent order that the Court has resumed in-person trials. Is it fair at this point unless things change or another emergency order occurs that for the pretrial conference and the trial, we should anticipate being in the courtroom?

THE COURT: Yes, we should. Thanks for asking that. I appreciate it. Yes, it will be in person.

MS. POLESKY: Okay.

only way we're not going to trial August 2nd would be -there is some possibility. Let's say three of the other
judges have jury trials scheduled for that day. If that
happened -- let me look at the calendar. And right now
there are two other -- there are two other jury trials
scheduled for August 2nd. I know the Chief Judge is trying
to get us in a position that we could do three trials in the
building at the same time, so we'll have to see.

The remaining weeks of August, there's not a week that doesn't have four trials scheduled. And I just know what my calendar looks like in the fall because we've been pushing back everything because of Covid, so I think our best bet is August 2nd, but -- well, everything in Covid, you know, requires conditional rulings I guess when it comes to scheduling.

1 We'll plan on August 2nd. Let me give you a 2 pretrial date. Sorry about this. I'm looking at some dates 3 here. 4 All right. Let's do a pretrial on July 14th, 5 and then I need then you to get me the pretrial order and the jury instruction proposal, any voir dire I'm going to 6 7 need on June 23rd. And we're back to hard copies, folks. mean, I know that is confusing, too. So I do need two hard 8 9 copies of every filing. We're back to the old rule in addition to the electronic filing. All right? 10 11 MR. MAHONEY: Your Honor, would you also like 12 motions in limine by the 3rd of June? 13 THE COURT: Well, they are part of the pretrial 14 order, so the answer is yes. And I'm sure that Delaware counsel for both sides are very well experienced and in 15 addition to being very good attorneys, so they'll help you 16 out to handle that. All right. 17 18 Any other questions? 19 MR. MAHONEY: None from plaintiff. 20 MR. KITTILA: Nothing from defendants, Your 21 Honor. Thank you. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you, all. 23 see you then at the pretrial conference. Take care. (Counsel respond, "Thank you, Your Honor.") 24 25 (Telephone conference concluded at 10:21 a.m.)

EXHIBIT B

Case 1:18-cv-01516-CFC-SRF Document 120-1 Filed 02/14/22 Page 14 of 14 PageID #: 2633

Theodore Kittila

From: Justin Billingsley <jcbillin9@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 12:03 PM
To: Theodore Kittila; William E. Green

Subject: FW: Resolution

From: Richard Moake <richard.d.moake@gmail.com>

Date: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 at 9:26 PM **To:** jcbillin9@gmail.com < jcbillin9@gmail.com >

Subject: Resolution

Dear Justin,

I hope last Sunday's daily text scripture (Proverbs 3:32) and paragraph 8 of this week's congregation Watchtower Study Article #49 (based on Leviticus 19:11-13) will motivate you to set matters straight with Jehovah's organization.

Your brother,

Rick Moake

--

Richard D. Moake